

**From:** [Tsiamis, Christos](#)  
**To:** [Carr, Brian](#)  
**Subject:** FW: CAG: WQ/Tech Committee Resolution for 12/1 CAG meeting  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 25, 2015 2:33:08 PM

---

**From:** Tsiamis, Christos  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 25, 2015 11:10 AM  
**To:** 'Marlene Donnelly' ; Loney, Natalie  
**Subject:** RE: CAG: WQ/Tech Committee Resolution for 12/1 CAG meeting  
Natalie,

Since a CAG committee has adopted a resolution with the intent of bringing it for a vote to the whole CAG, it is important for the effective functioning of the CAG that the resolution be presented to the CAG at the general CAG meeting immediately following the committee resolution.

This particular resolution is pertinent to the subject matter that will be discussed during the December 1<sup>st</sup> general CAG meeting and it is independent of the specific content of the presentations. Rather, the resolution addresses the committee's view on how information in general be utilized by the lead agency (EPA) in the management of the project and in the decision making process.

It is important, then, that the facilitator include the Water Quality resolution in the agenda of the upcoming meeting. The facilitator should also be reminded that there are no EPA updates for that meeting and therefore there will be more time available for discussion of CAG committee updates such as the above.

Thank you.  
Christos

---

**From:** Marlene Donnelly [<mailto:studio460@msn.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 25, 2015 10:37 AM  
**To:** Loney, Natalie <[Loney.Natalie@epa.gov](mailto:Loney.Natalie@epa.gov)>; Tsiamis, Christos <[Tsiamis.Christos@epa.gov](mailto:Tsiamis.Christos@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: CAG: WQ/Tech Committee Resolution for 12/1 CAG meeting  
Natalie,

I realized that you were not on the email list for the following CAG information and am passing it on to you at this time.

Happy Thanksgiving to you and your family,  
Marlene

---

Date: Wed, 25 Nov 2015 00:23:12 +0000

From: [mcshames@hotmail.com](mailto:mcshames@hotmail.com)

To: [studio460@msn.com](mailto:studio460@msn.com)

CC: [doug@forumfg.com](mailto:doug@forumfg.com)

Subject: RE: CAG: WQ/Tech Committee Resolution for 12/1 CAG meeting

I agree with Marlene. Since the statement doesn't directly address placement, it is not dependent on a particular presentation.

Sent from [Outlook Mobile](#)

On Tue, Nov 24, 2015 at 3:54 PM -0800, "Marlene Donnelly" <[studio460@msn.com](mailto:studio460@msn.com)> wrote:

Doug,

The statement would stand regardless of the information provided by the prospective developer--non of which is a done deal. And given the limited time until the EPA makes their decision I think time for the CAG statement is an important piece of CAG business.

-Marlene

---

Subject: Re: CAG: WQ/Tech Committee Resolution for 12/1 CAG meeting

From: [doug@forumfg.com](mailto:doug@forumfg.com)

Date: Tue, 24 Nov 2015 17:35:27 -0500

CC: [andrea@gowanuscanalconservancy.org](mailto:andrea@gowanuscanalconservancy.org); [bingham.beth@gmail.com](mailto:bingham.beth@gmail.com); [shipparts@aol.com](mailto:shipparts@aol.com); [ddbuxbaum@earthlink.net](mailto:ddbuxbaum@earthlink.net); [eymund@gmail.com](mailto:eymund@gmail.com); [frogg.tag@gmail.com](mailto:frogg.tag@gmail.com); [jjarmer@yahoo.com](mailto:jjarmer@yahoo.com); [pardonmeinbrooklyn@gmail.com](mailto:pardonmeinbrooklyn@gmail.com); [hungryhiker@aol.com](mailto:hungryhiker@aol.com); [kleinman@waterfrontalliance.org](mailto:kleinman@waterfrontalliance.org); [markkarwow@yahoo.com](mailto:markkarwow@yahoo.com); [mcsshames@hotmail.com](mailto:mcsshames@hotmail.com); [maryannchris36@aol.com](mailto:maryannchris36@aol.com); [ritamiller103@yahoo.com](mailto:ritamiller103@yahoo.com); [sabine13@gmail.com](mailto:sabine13@gmail.com); [sdixon@riverkeeper.org](mailto:sdixon@riverkeeper.org); [stevenmiller@superfinefilms.com](mailto:stevenmiller@superfinefilms.com); [sue.wolfe@corcoran.com](mailto:sue.wolfe@corcoran.com); [triadasamaras@gmail.com](mailto:triadasamaras@gmail.com)

To: [studio460@msn.com](mailto:studio460@msn.com)

Hi, please advise how you would like to proceed in presenting this to the CAG, it does seem like the CAG should listen to this new development and consider whether this language should be revised accordingly first before presenting this to the full CAG, I am also not sure that we have time to give this justice given that I think the agenda now is going to take up the full time available

If you want to proceed to put this on the table on 12/1 I will distribute it beforehand so folks have a chance to think it over

thanks

Doug

On Nov 24, 2015, at 3:42 PM, Marlene Donnelly <[studio460@msn.com](mailto:studio460@msn.com)> wrote:

Doug,

As a result of the November WQ-Tech committee meeting, the committee is submitting the following to be presented to the CAG during the Dec 1st general meeting.

CAG resolution drafted by the Water Quality/Tech Committee and presented to the CAG for a vote at the Dec 2, 2015 general meeting:

The Gowanus CAG has consistently called for the comprehensive cleanup of the Canal and its environs in accordance with the best scientific and engineering insights and solutions available to us that are consistent with the EPA Record of Decision. The CAG holds that these project goals

and criteria be applied to the decision regarding the location and design of the required sewage detention tanks. We urge the EPA to make their institutional decisions based on the best recommendations of their project design team and engineers. We trust that the prompt selection of such a site will also provide us with a longterm functional detention system at the earliest opportunity.

We ask that the EPA proceed without delay in the implementation of the remedy as we move towards an environmental cleanup for the health and well being of this whole community.

The committee discusses having the DEP engineers at the CAG meeting, along with the Nationals Grid engineers for the retention wall, to answer questions about the detention tank site engineering. It was understood that the EPA would be present for such a question and answer secession. National Grid rep, Terri Thompson was in attendance and she has since followed up to me to say that National Grid could not have their engineers participate in a discussion speculating on various design engineering proposal, but would engineer their recovery wall and bulkhead as they are directed by the EPA.

Regarding the development of this resolution, it was originally proposed at the meeting by Mark Shames and seconded by Katia. A draft was submitted by Mark which was alter through email discussions. Andrea Parker has stated that she respectfully disagrees with the statement and feels that there needs to be a detailed comparison of the engineering of the two possible detention tank locations.

Given the new Alloy proposal for the land which the DEP hopes to take by eminent domaine for the detention tank, the discussion has moved in another directions which which the committee members were unaware of at the time or the meeting.

Regards,  
Marlene